

***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn.
1. Claims 1-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Raehse et al (5,382,377) is withdrawn.
2. Claims 1-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boskamp et al (6,486,118) is withdrawn.

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1796

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Paatz et al (6,562,769).

7. Paatz et al disclose an aromatic shaped body produced to scent washing and cleaning detergents comprising perfumes, carriers and auxiliary agents (abstract).

Wherein said carrier comprises surfactants (col. 3, lines 55-col. 4, line 67); perfumes (col. 7, lines 60-67) and further, Paatz et al teaches that said premix is subject to granulated shaped bodies and perfume beads (col. 8, lines 1-10) which may comprise a diameters of 0.5 to 1.2mm ( see Table 1 and col. 14, lines 20-25 and claim 1).

8. Paatz et al disclose all of the instantly required it is considered anticipatory.

9. In the alternative, Paatz et al is silent with respect to the shaped body being formed in the mold of the first phase. However, this limitation is considered a process of the shaped detergent composition and therefore since the composition of said claimed shaped body is anticipated the process would be inherent to the compositions of Paatz et al.

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Necholas Ogden whose telephone number is 571-272-1322. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Necholus Ogden/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1796

6-8-2008